

From: phutnick@peakpeak.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/23/02 1:48pm

Dear Sirs:

I am writing to express my disappointment with the proposed settlement with Microsoft.

The settlement addresses only a small fraction of the findings of fact. Those few issues are addressed in an unenforceable manner.

The economic production of this monopoly is NOT WORTH THE PRICE in innovation, progress and freedom. Always bear in mind that when Microsoft uses the word innovate they mean taking the sort of standard protocols that have allowed the internet to flourish and BREAKING compatibility with other vendors software, creating lock-in to their platform. Witness DHTML, NTLM authenticated telnet, Microsoft's "Java" implementation, the Exchange IMAP connector, Jscript (Microsoft's broken JavaScript interpreter), IE HTML extensions, the list goes on. This is separate from their practice of application, and by extension, OS lock-in with byzantine, poorly documented, constantly changing file formats and proprietary communications protocols such as ".doc" (and other Office formats), Exchange/Outlook communication, secret APIs for use only by Office and other Microsoft software, SMB, et cetera. SMB is a particularly nasty piece of work, which has clearly been manipulated for the purpose of crippling work-alike software (i.e. Samba) for the purpose of maintaining the fileserver/desktop client tie that they worked so hard to oust Novell to achieve.

The situation only looks to get worse if this settlement is finalized. Microsoft's two-way lock-in with Windows and Office is solid. They have been attempting to add a third leg. First with the server, then with the browser, now with .NET.

Microsoft wouldn't be ABLE to abuse OEMs if THEY DIDN'T HAVE A MONOPOLY. The settlement denies them one avenue of abuse of their monopoly, it doesn't address the monopoly.

Is this monopoly in the public interest? Is it necessary for interoperability? Is it needed to motivated Microsoft to continue blessing us with their "innovations"? I am 26 years old, and I can just remember my parents being forced to lease their ugly, featureless phone from "The Phone Company." Bell made the same arguments about interoperability and innovation that Microsoft makes today.

Today I have a cell phone, I pay less for the cell phone (accounting for long distance) than my parents paid for their featureless home phone. I can call Japan for less than my parents paid to call half way across the

U.S. My parents suffered cross-talk, I enjoy digital quality over fibre optic lines. My parents called on a leased phone labeled "Property of Bell Telephone". If you fail, my children will compute with leased software labeled "Property of Microsoft". If you succeed, my children will find the fact that I had to run Windows so that I could run Office so that I could open .doc attachments so that I could get a job . . . quaint.

This monopoly serves only the monopolist.

It is the government's job to serve the people.

If the government fails to act on the people's behalf it is failing to act as a government of the people.

DO NOT ACCEPT THIS SETTLEMENT.

Sincerely,

Peter Hutnick
Citizen

This message was sent from Peak to Peak Internet.
DSL - V.90 modems - Web Hosting and Business connectivity
Please visit! <http://www.peakpeak.com>
(888)-600-PEAK
